

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AF
Jean-Paul Caruana)	
Application No.: 10/500,849)	Group Art Unit: 2876
Filed: July 7, 2004)	Examiner: LISA M CAPUTO
For: INDUCTIVE COUPLING)	Confirmation No.: 8748
EXCHANGE IN A PORTABLE)	
INTELLIGENT OBJECT WITH)	
CENTRAL AND PERIPHERAL)	
CIRCUITS)	

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated April 11, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 and 11-18. The continued indication that claims 8-10 contain allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

The examiner is thanked for the informative interview with Applicant's undersigned counsel. The substance of that interview is set forth in the following remarks.

The rejection of claims 1-7 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, on the basis of the Chalmers et al. reference (EP 0057602) in view of the Kreft patent (US 5,206,495), was maintained. New claims 16-18 were also rejected on the same grounds. In the response traversing this rejection, Applicant identified at least three distinctions between the claims and the disclosures of the references:

1) The peripheral circuit and the central data processing circuit are not electrically connected to one another;

2) A first communication interface is connected to the peripheral circuit and a second communication interface is connected to the central data processing circuit; and

3) The central data processing circuit and the peripheral circuit exchange data via the respective communication interfaces, through a station.

The most recent Office Action states that Applicant's arguments were not found to be persuasive. However, it was not apparent from the Action how the examiner is interpreting the references to disclose the claimed subject matter.

Regarding the first distinction, namely that the peripheral circuit and the central data processing circuit are not electrically connected to one another, Applicant's previous response noted that Figure 2 of the Chalmers reference illustrates that each of the components 1, 2 and 4-17 of the disclosed token are electrically connected to one another. Of particular significance, the control circuits 4 (data processing circuit) are connected to the display register 10 (peripheral circuit) via the data and address buses 22 and 23. In turn, the display register 10 is electrically connected to the decoder 13 and the LCD 14.

During the interview, the examiner indicated that the LCD 14 is not directly connected to the control circuits 4, due to the intervening decoder circuit 13. However, it was pointed out that, in the previous response, the word "directly" or "direct" was deleted from claims 1 and 7, to avoid such a restrictive interpretation of the claims. Even though the control circuits 4 and the LCD 14 may not be directly

connected, under the examiner's interpretation, they are still electrically connected, by means of the busses 22, 23, and the circuits 10 and 13.

The second point of distinction is related to this first distinction. Since the data processing circuit and the peripheral circuit are not electrically connected, they are each associated with respective communication interfaces that enable them to exchange data. In the portable token of the Chalmers reference, since the control circuits and the LCD are electrically connected, there is no need to provide respective communication interfaces for each of them to exchange data with one another. Rather, that exchange takes place by means of the busses and intervening circuits. Consequently, the Chalmers reference only discloses a single communication interface.

Furthermore, while the Kreft patent discloses a chip card having two coils 4 and 5, it only discloses that both coils are connected to the same circuits. There is no suggestion that one coil should be connected to a data processing circuit, and the other coil should be connected to a peripheral circuit on the card, so that they can exchange data between one another.

Finally, the claims recite that the data exchanges between the data processing circuit and the peripheral circuit take place via a station, with which each of the first and second interfaces communicate. In the token of the Chalmers reference, the communications between the control circuits 4 and the LCD 14 take place internally of the token. There is no reason to employ a station in that system to provide a platform for the two circuits to exchange data with one another.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Chalmers reference and the Kreft patent do not suggest the subject matter of claims


1-7 and 11-18 to a person of ordinary skill in the art, whether considered individually or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 11, 2007

By:


James A. LaBarre

Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620